

NiemanReports

September 1967

Winds of Change
by Gene Graham

The Future for Print
by Charles A. Sprague

Miracles of Modern Research
by Otto A. Silha

We Must be Doing Something Right
by Roger Tatarian

The Critical Responsibility of the Press
by John B. Oakes

NiemanReports

VOL. XXI, NO. 3

SEPTEMBER 1967

 Louis M. Lyons, Editor, 1947-64

Dwight E. Sargent, Editor

Editorial Board of the Society of Nieman Fellows

 Robert W. Brown
 Rock Hill Evening Herald

 Millard C. Browne
 Buffalo News

 William B. Dickinson
 Philadelphia Bulletin

 Tillman Durdin
 New York Times

 Roy M. Fisher
 Chicago Daily News

 Robert B. Frazier
 Eugene Register-Guard

 Thomas H. Griffith
 Time, Inc.

 Rebecca Gross
 Lock Haven Express

 C. Ray Jenkins
 Alabama Journal

 John Strohmeier
 Bethlehem Globe-Times

 E. J. Paxton, Jr.
 Paducah Sun-Democrat

 Harry T. Montgomery
 Associated Press

 Sylvan Meyer
 Gainesville Daily Times

 Robert Lasch
 St. Louis Post-Dispatch

 Edwin A. Lahey
 Knight Newspapers

 Smith Hempstone, Jr.
 Washington Star

 Published quarterly by the Society of Nieman Fellows from
 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138. Sub-
 scription \$3 a year. Second-class postage paid at Boston,
 Massachusetts.

Miracles of Research

By Otto A. Silha

 Mr. Silha, Vice President and General Manager of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, delivered this keynote speech at the Annual ANPA Research Institute Production Management Conference in Kansas City, Missouri.

Oscar Hammerstein, master lyricist of American musical comedy, in a song from "Oklahoma" more than 20 years

ago described the scene here today in Municipal Auditorium: "Ev'rythin's up to date in Kansas City. They've gone about as far as they c'n go."

We have all about us in the exhibit halls the latest developments in newspaper equipment and we hope that this program of the 39th Annual ANPA Production Management Conference will serve to bring you up-to-date with current technology, thus bearing out the prophecy of Mr. Hammerstein's lyric.

It is appropriate, therefore, this morning that I report to you on the "state of the union" of the ANPA Research Institute, which is the sponsoring body for this conference, in which we are most grateful to be joined by the mid-America Mechanical Conference.

I might say, almost parenthetically, that it is indeed gratifying to observe the large number of newspaper presidents, publishers, general managers and business managers in attendance here in Kansas City. I can recall the day not too many years ago when the only reason a publisher came to this kind of a meeting was when he was invited to make a speech.

Those days are gone forever because in the newspaper business today, change is the name of the game. If newspaper decision-makers are going to be in a position to know and understand what changes are in the offing and what the alternatives are—they must get out and look, see and smell what's happening in the fast-moving world of newspaper production and technology.

It is against this background that I direct your attention for a few minutes to the development and progress of the ANPA Research Institute. In my opinion the newspaper business is most fortunate to have this kind of rather unusual industrial trade organization. You have heard of others, I'm sure. The American Gas Association, for example, has a most successful research operation. In our own field, the Institute of Paper Chemistry, Gravure Research, Inc., and the Lithographic Technical Foundation all have physical research facilities. Time, Inc. is an example of a single corporation with intensified research in the graphic arts.

It is interesting to note that the television industry does not have its own technical research center. The reason is obvious: its operators and suppliers are deeply involved in corporate research activities such as that performed by RCA, DuMont, GE, Westinghouse and Sylvania, to name a few.

Fortunately for all ANPA member newspapers, the Research Institute was formed in 1947 and the Laboratory established at Easton, Pennsylvania in 1951. The early days of the Laboratory produced two developments which rather

(Continued on page 24)

Winds of Change

By Gene Graham

Mr. Graham is a professor of journalism at the University of Illinois and co-winner of the 1962 Pulitzer Prize for national reporting which he won while working on the Nashville Tennessean. He was a Nieman Fellow in 1962-63.

When the afternoon *Boston Traveler* was folded into its sister Herald July 10 after 142 years of publication, one of the clichés of American newspapering should have been put to rest.

With it, one hopes there also dies for all time the myth of the Liebling milieu that competition necessarily breeds good newspapers while a newspaper monopoly almost invariably ends in a communications counterpart of Cornelius Vanderbilt's "the public be damned."

The accepted infallibility of this myth is the origin of the cliché; for years American critics of the newspaper game have cited Boston and Louisville, Ky., as the exceptions to the myth's general rule.

Boston, the critics have said—and said and said and said—has had a spate of newspapers, all bad. Louisville, one of the nation's tightest monopolies, has had an excellent press. But these of course were the exceptions. Or so the critics reasoned.

These hackneyed examples should now be dropped if for no other reason than because Boston no longer has a spate of newspapers of any sort. The myth should go because it was always a myth.

It is more likely that Boston and Louisville were never the exception but nearer the rule. The lurid headlines of sex, sensation and strangulation go up in almost direct ratio to the competition. It is not always true that monopoly brings responsibility, but any reduction in the cut-throat variety certainly helps.

This is, as a matter of fact, quite well known in the newspaper business. But myths and clichés, being major products of the press, find it almost impossible to expire at the hands of their creators.

Knowing better, therefore, newsmen whomp up a case of nostalgia worse than Barry Goldwater's and weep in the bier of the latest casualty. With each successive New York demise, the nation's press has mourned for public consumption above Liebling's comfortable myth, sadly lamenting such things as those glorious, competitive days of yellow journalism and the fact that now the biggest metropolis of them all is apt to wind up with nothing better than the *New York Times*.

Ed Sullivan, seeming to overlook his nineteen years on the cathode tube, can always be counted upon to feed the

myth by holding a nationwide TV wake over the latest wave of unemployed gossip and gangland grist columnists. ("When I began newspeepering (cq) in this tewen (cq), there were . . . etc.")

But this is not to shout Hooray! for their passing. No sane or sensitive newsman likes to contemplate unemployment among his brethren. It is simply to deplore the mythology that misrepresents the American press and thus distorts the very important role it must continue to play. In the interest of responsibility, the shibboleths of the past should be shucked and the new competitive structure of all newspapers within the mass of the mass media more realistically appraised.

TV has been mentioned but it is merely one of the components, though one which was prominently mentioned by the *Traveler's* managers in explaining their merger. Another, and perhaps more important factor in the metropolitan field—particularly p.m.—is transport.

"Every time they opened a new superhighway," *Traveler* publisher George Akerson told *Time* Magazine, "we got kicked in the teeth. If you go home on a train, you read a newspaper. If you go in a car, you don't."

Indeed it was most significant that in the same week the *Traveler* made its swan song, its news columns reported the final run of the Boston & Maine's commuter to Concord, N.H. A full page advertisement placed in the Boston press the same week also announced the merger of the Atlantic Coast Line and the Seaboard.

So railroads merge and compete with trucks and buses and airlines and barges; newspapers merge and compete with radio and TV and mags and rival suburbans; both surrender to the commuter trade.

This should not be surprising. There has always been a strong relationship between mass transit and mass communications, and particularly the newspaper line of the latter. But romantics continue to feign outraged shock and work up considerable ire when newspapers or commuter trains close.

Long experience has taught me to expect this. There is, after all, one thing the twin "masses" have in common; everyone is an expert in running newspapers and transit systems.

A few years ago, in Nashville, this came home to me with all the dramatic impact of a flash on the road to Damascus. I was assigned to City Hall at the time and the duties included covering all the meetings of the Nashville City Council, which doubled in those days as the regulatory body governing the affairs of the Tennessee capital's mass transit system.

So tight was this regulation in such a political body that the harassed officials of the bus company were obliged to seek the permission of the Council when it felt compelled, in the interest of economics, not only to do such drastic

things as increase fares, but such relatively trivial matters as eliminate a single bus stop.

All these matters came to the floor of City Council for public hearing and frequently huge gatherings could be whipped up to whip the transit company. It all came down, I thought, to the fact that everyone wanted a bus right in front of his house, stopping no more than a block away, arriving and leaving every five minutes, with a seat always available. And all this, naturally, for no more than a nickel. With transfer privileges to all points.

Naturally, also, all these people, not to mention the councilmen, were experts in the mass transit business and could prove on paper that the bus company was making millions—do you hear, millions!—by hauling somewhat less than that number of people for a nickel a clip.

Well, ultimately, as in even New York, the nickel fare had to go, or at least the company thought so. The hearings went on for months and our own editorial experts, having dabbled at the edge of some of the exhibits, all of which claimed confiscatory rates, concluded that the company would just have to make-do with the five cent fare. The profit structure was adequate, our experts said, and besides an election was coming up. Whoever got politically blamed for the fare increase would take a worse whipping than the transit boys. And *our* man was in as mayor.

The newspaper's stand on this matter naturally did not sit well with the transit folks. Until the newspaper took its stand, of course, they had played much court to the publisher, editors, etc.—and had even bought coffee for us, the pencil-pushing peons.

Now all this stopped. And the voice of the transit attorney thundered massively on the council floor in angry condemnation of the newspaper for playing the expert and presuming to tell the transit company how it should run its business.

I don't know exactly when he quit excoriating the newspaper for this presumptuousness and began playing the expert himself, but somewhere in this rather prolonged speech the transit attorney, as the hill saying goes, quit preachin' and went to meddlin'. The sum of his address therefore was more a treatise on how newspapers ought to manage their affairs than how they ought not to manage mass transit.

He blamed the newspapers for increasing subscription rates, and allowed that advertising rates were scandalous. There ought to be an anti-trust investigation, he declared, and besides, his paper boy never hit the porch. Every time the bus company had an accident, he said, the photographers deliberately shot the scene from the worst possible angle and the editors always put these pictures, four columns, on page one when any idiot knew they should take no more than a half-column on the stock market page. If, indeed, such incidents were newsworthy at all.

The editorials were slanted, he insisted, and he never agreed with any of them. The sports pages invariably treated his alma mater with disdain and the best comics were always dropped. The horoscope was a waste of space and the wrong answer to the crossword puzzle appeared just yesterday. Worse, the society page got the wrong cut-line under his wife's picture after she had been nice enough to call the editor and alert her to the significance of this sapphire event on the social calendar.

Well, I jest of course—and exaggerate. But it was something like that. And out of it I arrived upon, besides the knowledge that all are experts on newspapers and transit, a principle of journalism that might be called Graham's Generality No. 1:

"A newspaper is as apt to please everybody as mass transit is to offer each customer a seat during rush hours."

This brings us to the major problem in any examination of the American newspaper: Defining it. For one can hardly assign it a general role in the larger generality of mass media without knowing what it is. And this, I submit, is a harder task than it first appears. For a newspaper means different things to different people for very good cause.

Mention "newspaper" in any academic community and one still encounters conditioned reflex: the first image to spring to mind is the *New York Times*. I certainly understand this. During the prolonged strike that blacked out the great grey giant during the winter-spring of 1962-63, I was at Harvard under a Nieman Fellowship, and dark was the daily gloom at the Harvard Faculty Club.

The pall was particularly thick around the tables that accommodated professors of government, economics, political science, history, law and such. After all, how was one adequately to lecture his classes, giving it all that certain sound of infallible authority, if he could not first consult with expertise, the source of his wisdom?

Three years later, during the second great *Times* blackout, I certainly understood their gloom all the more since I had become, by this time, a rather forlorn teacher of Contemporary Affairs myself.

The *Times*, despite George Lichtheim's comments in *Commentary*, the Gay Talese *Esquire* expose, and all the other dissections that seem in vogue, is still the greatest. Indeed, as Ed Lahey has observed, "If it did not exist, the Ford Foundation would have to start one."

In that same memorable address, Mr. Lahey also declared: "But there's room in this country for only one *New York Times*. God forbid that we could support more than one. If we ever got into an orgy of keeping well informed to the point that everyone was reading the equivalent of the *New York Times*, there'd be no coal dug, no yarn carded, no automobiles bolted together."

To that it could be added that no research in nuclear physics would be conducted, no lectures in ag economics

prepared, and no students would be in attendance in any of our classrooms. The *Times*, in fact, would have nothing to report except that everybody was reading the *Times*.

Even that great Timesman, James B. Reston, would only recommend 15 minutes of newspaper reading a day when he spoke to the University of Illinois freshman convocation in 1965. To paraphrase a point Mr. Reston made on that occasion, "You may not like the size of the *New York Times*—it is certainly not a small monstrosity—but you have to deal with the world as it is and not with the world of your desires and dreams."

A world informed by a *Times* in every town is as unreal a dream as the one that has every population-exploded student educated in a small, superior liberal arts college, and educated to the point of Renaissance Man. I think each of us should understand that, and that when we speak of the American newspaper we cannot speak in this context.

Neither is it precise or entirely accurate to deal with the American newspaper in the aforementioned alarmist terms of merging metropolitan monopoly.

Scripps-Howard's *Indianapolis News* folded in 1965, leaving that field to a Pulliam monopoly. Finally—and sadly—it was the turn of the *New York Herald Tribune*, once a great newspaper, and behind that, the lashup of the Trib and its former competitors, the *World Telegram & The Sun* and the *Journal-American*, also bit the dust. And more of this is going to happen before it's over.

For all their power and prestige, however, the metro monopolies are *not* the American newspaper. They are an element in it. Some of the papers so classified are not strictly metropolitan by any means.

The Louisville *Courier-Journal*, for example, is a regional newspaper that goes into every third mailbox in the state of Kentucky. It also circulates widely in southern Indiana. The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* covers a broad region extending into several states—primarily Missouri and Illinois—and the *Kansas City Star* blankets a virtual empire in the out-yonder Midwest.

The Memphis *Commercial-Appeal* fans out across West Tennessee, North Mississippi and half of Arkansas; the newspaper that hatched me, the *Nashville Tennessean* considers itself the regional voice of all of Middle Tennessee from the Tennessee River to the Cumberland plateau. It also has strong circulation in Southern Kentucky and Northern Alabama. The *Chicago Tribune*, it is said, depends as much for its strength on that nebulous term the rural "Downstate" as it does on the Windy City.

Or do you mean, when you say newspaper, the hometown parochial press?

There is, obviously, no one answer to the question, What is a newspaper? There are many answers. Before one can judge a newspaper—or define it—one must know something of what it conceives itself to be, what it considers its

function, where it is located, who it mainly serves, the nature of its constituency, and the special problems it encounters.

To understand what is happening to the American newspaper today, I think one must first understand what is happening to American life. The fate of newspapers has always been closely harnessed thereto.

And if I accurately witness what is happening in our nation today, we have just passed through a trend to giantism, to nationalization of thought and more than a degree of conformism for which, as David Riesman has suggested, the mass media are in great measure responsible.

But we are now seeing, I think, a crackup of this giantism. Part of this is a deliberate rebellion against it; part is a natural turn of events. There is a limit to the size of blocs into which people can be organized, and we have just about reached the limits, if we haven't turned the corner. And in a culture as individualist as ours, there is certainly a limit to the mold theory of how our society is made uniform.

The crackup to which I refer is not really new. The signs have been around for a long time—perhaps as long as the trend to urban giantism itself. For with every suburban shopping center that followed the folk to their bedroom cities around our metropolitan centers a crack appeared.

The crack widened with every suburban school built and with every PTA established. It has opened up with suburban service clubs—Kiwanis in Kenilworth instead of Downtown—and with the creation of more business establishments among them—Presto! A suburban newspaper.

At the moment, this process is receiving a new and powerful impetus as the federal Interstate System loops and crawls around our major communities. The interchanges for these superhighways are further out yet than the early shopping marts, and around each a potential new city rises.

This new interstate-interchange city affair is not just happening in Chicago, Boston, New York or Cleveland. Some years back I was invited to speak to a high school alumni group at a tiny Tennessee community, Gordonsville, which is situated two counties over and 30 miles fully, from Nashville. That's 30 miles as the crow flies, by the way. As the car crawled in those days it was a tough hour and a half drive over clogged two-lane thoroughfares lined by commercial alleys.

Fully a third of the audience, I would judge, worked in and around Nashville; yet quite a lot of them lived right there in Gordonsville and many more told me they were planning to move back and build homes there. I presume some did; today the new superhighway with its Gordonsville interchange is complete. In a half hour or so the country commuters can be at work. At night they can, if

they wish, milk the cow, read the local weekly—and get a later daily edition of the *Tennessean*.

We have all, I'm sure, noted the crackup of giantism in education, both higher and lower. At the revolutionary university level, of course, this has been accompanied by the deliberate rebellion of which we spoke earlier. So what happened first at Berkeley one fall, and to varying degrees on almost every other campus of the nation by springtime, had driven multiversity administrators by the following autumn to initiate crash efforts to remove the computer stigma from the student soul.

In New York, the public school system became so unwieldy and cumbersome that 30 district superintendencies were finally created, each in charge of a sub-system of about 35,000 students.

And so it goes. I doubt in such circumstances we should expect anything much different within the mass media.

In this connection, by the way, Theodore Peterson has long noted the crackdown of giantism, perhaps with another name, in the magazine field. Many general interest magazines in the past several years have folded or barely managed to survive, he noted, while scores of other, smaller magazines have come to thriving life.

The reason, he suggests, is that the general interest, mass-circulators like the ill-starred *Colliers*, or *Saturday Evening Post*, struggling back now, have been forced to give ground to smaller magazines with sharply-focused editorial content centered on the highly specialized interests of an increasingly specialized society.

Why buy the *Post* for its one article on politics, if you can buy the *New Republic*, *Reporter*, or the *National Review* or a host of others not only chock full of a complete range of political topics but having your own slant and prejudice on them?

Or why buy a general interest magazine for its occasional bit on sports, if you're a buff, when you can have *Sports Illustrated*?

There's a parallel here in newspapers. As our metropolitan giants grew, it became increasingly difficult to serve the growing mass on an intimate interest level. The bundle was too big, there were too many schools, and before long the Metro Press was forced to generalize its coverage. Result: it was no longer zeroed in on the primary interests of the family circle.

Just recently the editor of a major daily complained to me that he couldn't get his own kids to take the rubber band off the daily he edits, but they fight over the weekly suburban that serves the area in which he lives. Why not? It tells how the local football team made out, and may have a picture of the new class officers.

Is this, then, the American newspaper? It's a major element, and possibly the dominant one of the future. The

growing suburban press, coupled with newspapers serving medium-sized cities, is what I refer to as the Mama Bear Press. There are two reasons: First, it is middle sized—neither the tiny grassroots weekly nor the troubled Metro Monopoly. Second, its dish is quite frequently lukewarm porridge. I find Mama, at once, our greatest threat to cherished press freedom in this country, and our greatest hope to keep it alive.

Three years ago, in *Nieman Reports*, I suggested that “it is the middle-sized press which echoes, via inexpensive wire services, the national-international sameness of TV’s nightly headlines, and otherwise serves as little more than Our Town’s bulletin board. It is the middle-sized press which, in a weird arrangement of Federal Afghanistanism, decries the hijinks of Bobby Baker and Matt McCloskey without so much as a casual glance into His Honor the Mayor’s local campaign kitty, or how it was raised.

“It is an irony approaching stupidity, it seems to me, that today’s imperatively important middle-sized press does its very worst job where interest is potentially highest and where it enjoys a virtual monopoly of operations—in the *local public affairs forum*. The irony is compounded by an editorial page which matches the pallid reporting performance; on Viet Nam or the White House, of which the editor knows little more than he reads, there is wisdom abundant; on City Hall or the Statehouse, which the editor knows or should know on a first name basis, the silence is oftentimes deafening.”

I want to note here that there are exceptions to this generality, of course, and in the past three years I have imagined some improvement here and there. But in the main there is not much reason to revise that original appraisal. The indictment is, I believe, generally true and this sort of quality will not suffice.

It will suffice no more for the metropolitan press than it will for those in the medium-sized, or even the tiny, range. For the knowledge explosion accompanies its population twin and well educated, superior readers will not be held by inferior pap in any man’s newspaper of any size.

Moreover, as better educated readers learn how much of their total tax dollar is actually being spent at the state and local levels (more often from the League of Women Voters than from the local press), the old federal budget bugaboo is not even going to excite John Birch. State and local spending is in the neighborhood of \$70 billion a year now and, defense aside, even the federal dollar is spent at the local level. If boondoggle is found in poverty wars or the Great Society falls short of success, it will be up to local newsmen to point it out.

There is no special talent in the Washington press corps for ferreting out waste or graft or incompetence in a federal

program that has its headquarters on the third floor of the county courthouse or a room adjoining the mayor’s office in City Hall.

With all their expertise and ability, reporters operating at the national level cannot really get to the nuts and bolts of problems rising from Boston ghettos or the stinking streams that plague West Virginia and East Kentucky. And press freedom was extended for no other cause but to operate in these arenas. It was not granted to give the people Red Smith or Ann Landers or Doctor Steincrohn or Andy Capp, however interesting, entertaining or important their observations might be.

So what is the American newspaper and what is its role in the whole of the growing thing we call mass media?

It is the *New York Times*, all right, with its excellent staff which could probably improve its foreign news service. And it likely will, too, as tieups like that of the *Washington Post* and *Los Angeles Times* begin to offer a rival wire service sometimes superior to the great NYT in coverage, analysis, unbiased reporting and, indeed, in downright hard accuracy and news judgment.

This, by the way, is a development that could not have been foreseen by the late Mr. Liebling when he expressed confidence that as soon as other New York newspapers left the field, the *Times* would undoubtedly withdraw foreign staff and cheapen its service.

So the American newspaper is also the *Washington Post* and its West Coast wire partner, surviving giant in a city where such grave news monopoly concern was once sounded. It is, indeed, all of the metropolitan press, becoming more generalized now, and merging and constricting as the public it serves grows ever more remote from it—except perhaps intellectually. Here, I believe, may be the metropolitan’s future, though one hesitates to duplicate the mistakes of others by trotting out a too-hasty crystal ball.

But it will most assuredly become more of a daily news-magazine, more selective in content, more interpretive and editorial in its approach to local problems, not attempting to be a paper of record and certainly not of records hung up by schoolboy athletes clustered around its home base in the heart of megopolis.

The American metropolitan press may even move, one day, into the role of such papers as Britain’s *Economist*, largely a commentary, a forum, a place for views and learned columnists to meet and discuss weighty problems. The intellectually-oriented audience of any metropolitan giant should be large enough to sustain such a newspaper—if we make out as well as we are always predicting with that information-knowledge explosion.

There is evidence that some of the bigger ones will go national. Dow-Jones’ *National Observer*, a weekly that

reports common denominator problems and now produces newsbooks, too, periodically, may yet prove a forerunner of sorts.

The American press is regional newspapers and it should be noted that one of these, the *Courier-Journal*, was performing a regional function this year when it won the Pulitzer Gold Medal by launching a conservation attack on its state's most powerful extractive industry—coal.

What is the press? Well, it is the Mama Bears, too, and even the little bears that are never, never—no matter how

you may wish it—going to resemble the *New York Times*. These will always be parochial—and don't say it with such a superior sneer because that's their business. And there is such a thing as a parochial person being sophisticated in his understanding and cosmopolitan in his view and approach to his own parochialism.

What is the *role* of the American newspaper? Roles is the answer, and intelligent people should expect no more than that each carry out well what is his particular lot to perform.

Price Waterhouse Foundation To Sponsor Another Nieman Fellow

The Price Waterhouse Foundation has announced that it will sponsor a Nieman Fellowship for a business and financial writer for the academic year 1968-69. Newspapermen seeking this award must file the regular application provided by the Nieman office at 77 Dunster Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, and be chosen by the Nieman Selection Committee appointed annually by Harvard University. This year the Nieman Fellow sponsored by Price Waterhouse is Allen T. Demaree of McGraw-Hill Publications (Business Week Magazine).

The Future for Print

By Charles A. Sprague

Mr. Sprague, Editor and Publisher of the Oregon Statesman in Salem, Oregon, delivered this Sigma Delta Chi Lecture at Indiana University in April.

Let me confess that for over half a century my professional and business interest has revolved around print. I would not say, however, that experience of that length qualifies me to forecast the future for print. I am fully aware of the revolutionary changes in technology which have come to the mechanics of printing, and of the challenge which print faces as a medium.

I used to say that printing was frozen in the stone and lead age, as it was literally. The printer's stone is now a steel turtle but its function remains the same as in the earliest days of printing. And lead, whether in individual foundry-cast characters or molten for line casting, is still the principal raw material for type composition. The hand press evolved to the power press, the platen to the cylinder and web-fed rotary press which prints from a curved stereoplate. Photoengraving increased the use of illustrations. Mergenthaler's invention of the linotype initiated a revolution in typesetting. There print technology stopped, save for refinements in machinery to improve quality of product or speed up production.

Within late decades, however, radical changes have come, notably printing by the offset process and photo-electric type composition. Computers are being put on line to speed up production. Nor is the end in sight. Engi-

neers have been working on scanning from typed copy. After centuries of relatively slow progress, print technology is being caught up in the current of rapid change.

In contrast with the sluggishness of print technics have been the amazing developments stemming from Marconi's invention of the wireless, now exemplified in radio and television. They challenge the print medium so that now we must speak of the "media" rather than just "the press." The old word communications has come into common use with new significance. Some schools of journalism have been rechristened Schools of Communications, so as to envelop the whole means of transmission of information. Personally, I haven't liked that use of the term. To me its connotation is one of mechanics, like telegraph, telephone, whereas journalism connotes content.

The new media of communication are more than just radio and television. We have recordings, movies, magnetic tape, video tape. And, unique in our time is the transfer of intelligence through holes punched in cards. Teaching machines are being introduced to speed up the learning process. We may be on the edge of a great breakthrough in education.

All these provide new and vigorous competition to Print. The electronic media compete for time, for money, for influence. Publishers of newspapers regarded radio at first as something of a leech for its early pirating of news; and they have been prompt to criticize television for its sins though they are forced to recognize the viability of both radio and television.

Loss of advertising revenue to the electronic media has

been of serious concern to publishers of newspapers and magazines. They have seen many of their accounts switch particularly to television, and have seen their share of the total dollar volume of advertising diminish while that of television has been rising rapidly. Publishers have been fearful, too, of loss of readers because of the popularity of radio and TV, and concerned about their future readership.

Forecasts for print have been ominous. The televised facsimile using a home recorder has been talked about for quite a while as a possible substitute for the conventional printed newspaper.

At the ASNE convention in Montreal last year Fred Friendly, who terminated his position with CBS quite abruptly, painted quite a glowing picture of imminent developments in electronic communication. Since then, the Ford Foundation, of which he is a consultant, has proposed a greatly expanded non-commercial network for radio and TV whose construction and programs could be financed by launching a satellite to serve both public and private stations. Profits from the satellite operation would go to beef up programs on the public stations.

A Carnegie Commission reported a plan to set up a Corporation for Public Television, and a bill to do so has been introduced in Congress with endorsement of President Johnson. It would be governed by a board of 15 appointed initially by the President. The corporation would be non-profit, and would be declared "not to be an agency or establishment of the government."

The purpose of the corporation would be to expand the number of public (that is, non-commercial) radio and TV stations, provide interconnection and facilitate development of good programs both for the network and for local presentation. Grants would be received from private sources. The pending bill calls for the federal government to provide \$10,000,000 initially for construction and \$9,000,000 for programs. (Lester Markel, writing in the NY Times Sunday Magazine, thinks it would need 20 times that amount for programs.)

It should be noted that the word used in the title is Public, not Educational. The word educational seems to repel viewers. Public Television would not be just an educational tool. The word public implies a far wider range in programing to reach larger audiences. If public television is launched on the scale contemplated, supported by government subsidies and large grants from foundations, offering through a greatly expanded network programs of news, information and entertainment of quality better than commercial TV's "wasteland," then print will face a new competitor, not for the advertising dollar, but for the time and attention of the "consumer."

President Johnson has stated that public television "must be absolutely free from any federal government interfer-

ence." Perhaps it will be; but skeptics will fear that its Big Eye may become a creature of George Orwell's Big Brother. Fred Friendly, however, observes that he is more fearful of Poor Brother than Big.

The significance, as far as print is concerned, is not the immediate effect of this accretion to electronic communication, but to the future. We adults were reared on print. Our children and grandchildren are being reared on radio and television, to say nothing of recordings and rock-and-roll music. Children of this and future generations will be mentally conditioned by these new media.

A British author, Sir Compton Mackenzie, has predicted that a century hence only certain professional classes will be able to read and write. Most communications will be via the spoken word or the tele-image. Letters will become obsolete. Magnetic tapes will be much more convenient.

And Roger Thabault, a French authority, writing in the 1960 Yearbook of Education, has said:

"Schools and universities are making desperate efforts to uphold an educational system based on the *written* word and on masterpieces of literature. They are fighting a rear-guard action doomed to failure. . . . We must teach at the same time the accepted rules of *grammar*, this *new* system of communication, embracing colors, shapes and rhythm to all of which children are most responsive."

The Rev. Father Culkin, director of the Center for Communications at Fordham University, reported in an article recently in Saturday Review that today's child has watched television for some 3,000 to 4,000 hours before he starts to school, and by the time he graduates has clocked 15,000 hours of TV time and 10,800 hours of school time.

It must be conceded that the monopoly of print has been broken. It must fight to hold a position in the multiple media of communications.

At this juncture print is under heavy assault by a valiant exponent of the new media, Marshall McLuhan, a professor at the University of Toronto, who is soon to transfer to Fordham. He has illuminated the northern skies like an Aurora Borealis with his flashing aphorisms, introducing a new dispensation in the mental behavior of humans as a consequence of the new communications phenomena. "The medium is the message" was his battlecry, since modified to "The medium is the massage," the latter word implying the beating which old habits of thinking are having to take. To quote from some of his writings:

"The electronic technology is within our gates, and we are numb, deaf, blind, and mute about its encounter with the Gutenberg technology, on and through which the American way of life was formed."

"The alphabet (and its extension into typography) made possible the spread of the power that is knowledge, and shattered the bonds of tribal man, thus exploding into an agglomeration of individuals. Electric writing and speed

pour upon him, instantaneously and continuously the concerns of other men. He becomes tribal once more."

McLuhan rests his thesis on the differing modes of perception between print and the audio-visual medium. To quote:

"The visual (the perceptual mode of the man raised on print) makes for the explicit, the uniform and the sequential in poetry, in logic, in history. The non-literate modes are implicit, simultaneous and discontinuous, whether in the primitive past or in the electronic present."

Again: "Electricity ended sequence by making things instant; it is the new mosaic form of the TV image that has replaced the Gutenberg structural assumptions . . . The message of the movie medium is that of transition from lineal connection to configuration."

One of his interpreters, Father Culkin, previously quoted, offers this clarification of McLuhanism:

"The medium alters the perceptual habits of its users . . . In the process of delivering content the medium also works over the sensorium of the consumer."

"The media shape both content and consumer and do so practically undetected."

"And once a culture uses such a medium (print) for a few centuries, it begins to perceive the world in a one-thing-at-a-time, abstract, linear, fragmented, sequential way. And it shapes organizations and schools according to the same premises. The form of print has become the form of thought. The medium has become the message."

"The electronic media have broken the monopoly of print; they have altered our sensory profiles by heightening our awareness of aural, tactile and kinetic values."

Are they tolling the bell for the demise of print? Are we who are in print like the crew of the 19th Century Limited train bound for the boneyard, with our future limited to the commuter service of publishing legal notices, births and deaths and classified ads?

Before surrendering the field I think we in print should rise to the challenge. Let us examine the McLuhan thesis.

This precipitates us deep into the field of psychophysics, into the relation of the senses to the learning process. This is far beyond the competence of a mere editor. Nor have I found very much help in discussing the subject with professional psychologists.

Let us examine the role of print as compared with the electronic media. We may grant that print, or rather reading print, is linear and sequential. And we recognize that the televised program comes as instant configuration engaging both sight and sound and involving movement. It is true that the alphabet is artificial, a kit of flexible tools for recording language, unneeded where communication is oral. But if we are to consider the mechanics of communication alone, print has some definite advantages.

Print is durable, not just a flash on the screen or a

voice quickly fading. The reader controls his medium. He follows his own pace. He can have "instant replay" or remote. Print permits him to be selective, choosing what to read and when. It is portable in newspaper, periodical or book form. Print is more reliable, not dependent on the memory of a transient scene or voice. Video tape recorders may serve as a substitute, but they are awkward and expensive. Conceivably we may put libraries on tape, which would allow individual control and save a great deal of space; but that day is not in sight, save for highly specialized libraries.

On the score of practical utility, print holds the lead as the primary means of acquiring knowledge.

But I would not rest the case for print simply on its superior utility and convenience. I believe this linear, sequential route in the learning process has real virtue. Grant that perception by the audio-visual medium may be more complete, and so far as the picture goes, more rapid. But there is more to the intellectual process than perception. There is the process of cognition. The bits and pieces of knowledge which come to the brain via the senses must be worked over, digested and assimilated to become the basis of judgment and action. Both sequence and continuum are vital elements in the complete intellectual process. Reading not only supplies the material but it engages the mental faculties for making use of the knowledge acquired. As a medium it is a superior stimulant to criticism, essential in the exercise of judgment, because reading requires active rather than passive participation.

Television, on the other hand, is primarily theatre, graphic, illustrated, often dramatic. Nothing can equal it in stirring the emotions. I think this explains why television has developed chiefly into a medium of entertainment. Its documentaries can have great impact; but print is the meat and potatoes that feed the powers of reasoning.

Without being captious I would offer McLuhan himself as proof of my thesis. He has been busy propagating his doctrine, not so much by the electronic media as by books and lectures. Auditors find it difficult to follow his intellectual coruscations and readers have to do some mental gymnastics to follow the line of thought in his books. Print is the pre-eminent medium for communicating his ideas. Likewise his interpreters resort to print to offer their exegesis of McLuhan's doctrine.

There is another aspect to print which should be reckoned with. That is writing. While writing, including literature, long antedated print, it was Gutenberg's invention of movable type which opened a vast market for writing. Take away print and what outlet would the writer have?

Literature is one of the fine arts. It is the distillation of thought in language form whose principal medium is the printed page. The electronic media serve other art forms, but do very little for literature.

We have observed in the demise of some old magazines and newspapers a contraction of the market for writing. Consumer taste differs now, too. What we used to call belles lettres is out of date. Public appetite for poetry seems to languish. On the other hand there is growing demand for books of biography, history, travel. A good book is still a source of supreme enjoyment. It provides emancipation such as Machiavelli described when, having lost his job with the Medicis in Florence, impoverished, eking out an existence on a poor farm, he wrote of how he passed his evenings:

"At the threshold I take off my peasant clothes, dirty and spotted with mud, and don royal and festive garments. Thus worthily dressed, I step among men of antiquity and, feeling no weariness, forgetting all my troubles, and neither fearing poverty nor dreading death, I live wholly among them."

And Machiavelli went on to write his great classic of political science: "The Prince."

Surely the taste for literature will long keep print alive.

The marketplace casts an odd commentary on McLuhanism. Owners of those media most prominent in the era he extols are making heavy investments in print. Columbia Broadcasting System, for instance, has offered around \$280 million for the publishing firm of Holt, Rinehart and Winston. International Business Machines, the company at the apex of electronics, has bought Science Research Associates which engages in publishing. Xerox acquired the publishing division of Wesleyan University. Radio Corporation of America, the pioneer in radio and TV technology, took over Random House, another distinguished publisher. International Telephone and Telegraph Company picked up Howard W. Sims, and Raytheon bought D. C. Heath and Company. Litton Industries reached out and bought American Book Company.

The explanation offered is that they see a growing market for school and college textbooks. They may also see a market for teaching machines which, with the aid of educators, they can manufacture and then market through the

distributing organization of the book houses. They may anticipate new technics in printing, especially type composition, which will reduce the cost of printing. At any rate we have seen these leaders in electronics becoming heavy investors in publishing houses. I cannot say that I welcome this shift in proprietorship. I can't help but question whether the taste and discrimination manifested by the old publishing houses will be preserved. My point, though, is that these investments belie the forecasts of doom to print implicit in McLuhanism.

I do not think we can safely build a future for Print just on the trading in stock of publishing houses. Its future must lie in the service it performs in the face of all competitors, present and to be invented. Its survival will depend on holding the advantage in convenience, durability, portability. But it must also meet the test of human psychology. Is print an indispensable medium for the transmission of knowledge and the stimulus of the mind of man? If it is, it will survive.

It is conceivable, however, that reading may decline. If, in the fully automated age, teaching machines can readily instruct workers in the essentials for performing their tasks, or if, in an era of abundance, people can be sustained with a minimum of personal effort, then the incentive to pursue learning, which could well be served through reading, may be lost. That would mean that the mass media had contributed to mass intellectual decadence. I prefer to anticipate that both the requirements of the tasks and the added leisure supplied by full mechanization will stimulate intellectual growth and encourage a wider and deeper appreciation of the arts, including literature.

To help print survive, those who minister to it must give it the sustenance of superior writing, writing that attracts and holds readers. Print, I would say, is "here to stay"; and so are the other media such as radio, television, tapes. Each has a niche in the spectrum of communications. At times they overlap; at times they compete. The part print will play will depend in great measure on the performance of us who are its servitors.

The Critical Responsibility of the Press

By John B. Oakes

Mr. Oakes, Editor of the Editorial Page of The New York Times, delivered this lecture at the University of California (Riverside).

Although it is nearly four years since I last saw the Riverside campus of the University of California—only a glimpse of some handsome new buildings rising above a sea of mud—I feel very much at home here. It's not because of the new buildings, which seem to have increased in number, and certainly not because of the mud, which seems to have disappeared, but rather it's because there is a kind of affinity between the New York Times and this great university. One or the other of us seems always to be in trouble.

On my last visit here, the newspaper had just emerged from a long ordeal at the hands of forces that were outside of our control, but intimately affecting our destiny. I am referring of course to a strike that lasted 114 days. Now, as I come here four years later, it is your university that has been through the ordeal, also at the hands of forces that intimately affect your destiny, but forces that you—no more than we—could control.

Neither of us is out of the woods yet; we probably never will be. But we have this in common, too; that it is the

characteristic of a great newspaper and a great university alike to be similarly involved in a constant quest to throw light in the dark places, to push outward the boundaries of man's knowledge and to engage an ever-expanding community in the endless search for truth.

The basic goal of the free university and of the free newspaper is essentially the same. The *raison d'être* of both kinds of institution is the acquisition and the dissemination of knowledge. One deals more intensively with the facts and events of the day, the other with the (relatively) eternal verities. But the more complex our world and interrelated our civilization, the more necessary and indeed inevitable it is that the newspapers probe, explain and interpret not merely the actions of the day, but the thoughts and philosophies of the era; and, conversely, the more it becomes necessary for the highest institutions of learning to be in touch with and participate in the world and to be prepared to reevaluate it. The ivory tower is no more suitable to the office of the editor than it is to that of the Dean of Freshmen.

In the newspaper world, this development has interesting effects that are becoming increasingly visible. The newspapers—that is the progressive ones, whether they are the size of the Riverside Press-Enterprise or of the New York Times—are more and more concerned in their news coverage, their personnel and their tone, with the presentation of something more significant than last night's police blotter. There is among these newspapers a constantly increasing

effort to give the news in depth and breadth, to help the reader understand not just what happened yesterday, but why and how it happened and what it means in the long-range context.

This trend is very evident not only in the context of the news columns themselves, but also in the kind of people who are being added to the staff of progressive newspapers. I am not going to pretend that every reporter who is hired today is a Ph.D., but I am going to say that the tendency is clearly to employ on the reportorial and editorial staff of modern-minded newspapers men of education, even specialization, instead of the old carefree, slap-happy, types, with which we are all familiar from the novels of yesterday and the movies of today.

Nor am I arguing that newspapers and newspaper publishers have suddenly "got religion." I think this changing attitude toward the presentation of news, reflected in every leading paper from the West Coast to the East, is an inevitable reaction to the demands on newspapers today. You will note that the newspapers that have recognized the growing sophistication of their readership and the growing necessity of presenting the news with wide-angle vision and telescopic sights—these are the newspapers that, generally speaking, are the successful and growing newspapers. Those that have stuck exclusively to the old patterns of news treatment that appeal to the lowest common denominator of readership, and place their stress on entertainment rather than information—these are likely to be the newspapers that are as static in their circulation figures as they are in their minds. They may not be on the way out, but on the whole, they are not on the way up.

As Clark Kerr has pointed out, the university—multiversity or not—is in turn becoming increasingly involved in the life of contemporary society. "The university as producer, wholesaler and retailer of knowledge cannot escape service," he wrote: "knowledge today is for everybody's sake." This trend has varied effects on the university, on its faculty, its courses, its administration, its students; and as Dr. Kerr points out, "there are those who fear further involvement of the university in the life of society." But, good or bad, the involvement is there, and gives every indication of increasing and intensifying with a new kind of commitment to the living society—sometimes to the extreme distress of alumni, legislators, and donors.

My point is not that universities are becoming like newspapers—God forbid—or newspapers like universities, but rather that there is in the broadest possible sense a correspondence or correlation of goal. What I am really saying is that newspapers too are in the knowledge business. We are—or at least many of us try to be—something more than mere purveyors and retailers of events; we are—or try to be—something more than Autolycus, that picker-up of unconsidered trifles.

There is something symbolic in the fact that the largest newspaper yet to have disappeared from the New York scene was named the *Mirror*. Newspapers today can no longer be mere mirrors; they are being forced—by the complexity of life, of news, of domestic affairs and international relations, of science and technology, of instant communication and exploding education, of the interrelation of ideas and the interaction of peoples—they are being forced to do more than relate events though they most emphatically must continue to do that, too. The world has become too complicated, and the controlling powers in the world too broadly disseminated, for it to be possible any longer to be satisfied with simplistic accounts of current events or the fabric of current history. If it is to survive as a serious factor at this stage of our civilization, the newspaper of today has to do more than report on the news pages; it must take its stand, commit itself to a philosophy, interpret and evaluate and criticize—and the editorial page is the place for that.

You will have noticed that the title I have chosen for this address, "The Critical Responsibility," carries with it a double meaning. I have tried to convey in this title the thought that the responsibility of the press to elucidate, inform and criticize is as important a function as carrying the bare bones of the news, is in fact *critical* to the health and even the life of our country today. But the phrase "The Critical Responsibility" also refers to the obligation of the newspaper to be *responsible* in its criticism, skepticism and independent leadership rather than dogmatism and blind partisanship.

In the first sense, this critical responsibility of the press—to itself, to its readership, to its country—is to project that added dimension of analysis and criticism. Without this element, it seems to me that the press becomes a mere dead reflector of a jumbled concatenation of events that might conceivably entertain but only accidentally can enlighten. It is critical—and I use the word advisedly—it is critical to this country that the vast newspaper-reading public gain some understanding of what it reads: for it is precisely that public that controls the threads of government and, in the last analysis, makes the great decisions.

Let us look at just two major areas where this responsibility is in the literal sense critical at the present time; one is in the realm of foreign affairs and the other in domestic.

For at least the past four years—certainly since resolution of the Cuban missile crisis—the most pressing question of foreign policy affecting the American people has been the constantly escalating war in Vietnam. No matter what one's views on Vietnam are, there can be no argument that the United States has gradually slipped and slid from an apparently innocuous beginning, when we furnished a few military advisers to President Diem, into a major

engagement involving an expeditionary force of over 400,000 American troops in this jungle-covered corner of south-eastern Asia. I have just been there, just a few weeks ago; and, believe me, whatever else one thinks about it, this *is* a major engagement of the United States, the physical extent, depth and intensity of which has to be seen to be fully appreciated.

This is the undeclared war, the unwanted war, and despite the enormous amount of truly excellent reporting that has been done from the scene, the unknown war—or, at the very least, the un-understood war. This is the war in which, before the year is out, surely a half-million American soldiers will be fighting on the spot, while most of the rest of us back home are almost totally unaffected in our daily lives, and, except for relatively few dissenters, are still largely un-involved in what is actually happening.

Here is a critical situation affecting the American democracy, in which it is the responsibility—the critical responsibility—of the American press to elucidate, to explain, to question. There have indeed been some newspapers and newspaper men who have not fallen into the too frequent pattern of unquestioning acceptance of official statements and government hand-outs. Those newspapers and newspaper men—and I assure you there are both hawks and doves among them—are carrying out one of the prime functions of the press, in time of war no less than in time of peace.

In war time this is to do much more than repeat the number of casualties, the victories, the bombings, the speeches. This is to present to the American people the real currents of thought and of direction in Washington and in Vietnam, to try to get the picture of what is happening behind the communiqués and what is being said in Hanoi no less than in Saigon and in Washington, to put the physical developments of this so-called limited war in a realistic social, economic and political frame, and freely to comment on it as free men see fit.

Since our own Government through the years has been sometimes less than frank, or at the very least confused and self-contradictory, in explaining and defining both the political and military objectives of American policy in Vietnam, it is a particularly critical responsibility of the press to do its best to clarify the situation for the American public.

Right now, we do not know precisely what the obvious military build-up means; but it appears—or at least it appears to me—that the Government has at some time in the last few months decided on a new course: achievement of a military victory over North Vietnam through maximum application of conventional (non-atomic) power. It appears to me that our Government no longer considers negotiation a practicable way out and is therefore unwilling to take the one unilateral step that could conceivably lead

to the opening of negotiation: a halt in the bombing. If indeed this analysis does accurately describe our Government's position, it is of critical importance to the American people that they know about it, discuss it and debate it; and it is a critical responsibility of the press to present the issue.

I certainly reject the proposition that has been advanced by high officers of government, to my personal knowledge, ever since the days of President Diem and Madame Nhu, that critical comment in the American press on the developments in Vietnam was only giving aid and comfort to the enemy. It was almost as though one were advancing the thesis that the less Americans knew about what was going on in Vietnam the better—though we were even then being inextricably drawn into the bloody vortex.

Just as Vietnam is far and away the most critical of all foreign issues facing our country today, so the Negro ferment all over the United States is the most critical domestic issue. And to say that newspaper analysis and criticism of Vietnam is *causing* Vietnam—which is almost what is being sometimes said nowadays—is just as nonsensical as to say that newspaper commentary on the Negro ferment is the cause of that ferment.

I hardly have to enlarge on the question of Negro frustrations to an audience in Southern California only too familiar with Watts; but the point I want to make is that it is our responsibility on the editorial pages to do more than merely report the riots; it is our responsibility to try to understand and explain the causes and in this endeavor to seek out something more than the superficial cures.

It isn't good enough to do what one leading newspaper did the other day in a southern city I was visiting: denounce the public appearance of Stokely Carmichael on a college campus in that city and castigate in the wildest terms the university president for letting him appear—regardless of the fact that the violence of the editorial itself only exacerbated the bitterness and frustration and anger that burst forth in a subsequent student riot.

In fact, when we combine the endemic Negro unrest with the concurrent student unrest, we have an explosive situation in many of our schools and colleges today where Negroes and students, and particularly Negro students, are striving desperately to achieve a sense of identity, in a furious eruption against administration, trustees and any or all expression of authority.

One aspect of this movement among Negroes that is not yet fully appreciated is its adverse effect on the advance of integration; for some of the more radical and articulate Negroes are so deeply concerned with Negro identity, with the necessity of proving that Negroes can and must stand by themselves unaided, that they are in effect implicitly rejecting integration. I happen to think that the philosophy of these leaders—and believe me I

know from personal experience that many of the brightest students follow them—is highly retrogressive.

But right or wrong, the various calls for a greater share in government—whether in the form of “black power,” “participatory democracy” or whatnot, and whether on college campuses, in local school boards or in the streets, have to be listened to, and the attempt made to understand them if we are to be able to cope with situations of potentially the very gravest danger to our society.

Here again I feel that while some of this picture is being presented to the American people, much of it is being lost in the exciting accounts of yesterday’s violence, or the sensational actions of, or reactions to, a Stokely Carmichael or a George Wallace. Here is where the press has a responsibility that really is critical in terms of the future welfare of the United States. Here is where the press has to face the unprecedented social and intellectual crisis of a frustrated segment of our society, a crisis which it cannot begin to interpret to the country—and it has as yet hardly begun—unless it learns to listen with new ears, to perceive with new eyes, to analyze with new understanding. This is a major part of “The Critical Responsibility.”

The other facet of this phrase, as I am using it, relates to the obligation of the newspaper not only to criticize but to do so with a pervading sense of public responsibility, i.e. it is the business of criticizing responsibly. If a newspaper is a living thing, as I think it is, its news content may be its life blood, the front page may be its face, but its editorials—its criticism and its commentary—are its very soul. And when the editorials are flabby or complacent or irresponsible, then that newspaper has lost its soul—and also lost its character.

If the editorial page of a newspaper is to hold popular respect it has to be utterly indifferent to unpopularity; it has to duck no issue and court no man. The first place to begin, of course, is with elections; for there is where you have to choose between two men, and, when you do it publicly, you make one a friend for a day and the other an enemy for life. But choose you must.

On my newspaper, since we talk all the time about the obligation of the citizen to vote, we think we have an obligation to help him vote. So we offer our opinion on as many contests in every election as we possibly can, running literally into the scores when there are legislative, county, and municipal offices at stake, as there often are in New York, in addition to the biennial election of more than 40 members of Congress in the metropolitan area. We try our best to find out what we can about the candidates, which often isn’t much; but we think we probably know more about them than do most of the voters—though quite a few of the voters often pay distressingly little attention to our advice.

The adventurous business of making political choices doesn’t stop with the New York area, either.

Although Californians sometimes don’t like to acknowledge it, New York really is part of the United States; and it is my understanding that California is, too. So when this most populous state in the Union had a gubernatorial contest last year, I thought we New Yorkers should voice our opinion about it—and we did. Judging from the letters I subsequently received, a good many Californians think the easternmost boundary of the United States is—or ought to be—the Hudson River, or perhaps the Mississippi.

I didn’t mind their anger, but what I won’t accept is the frequently reiterated view that a California gubernatorial (or, for that matter, Senatorial) election is “none of our business.” It’s very unfair of smog-drenched Californians to insist that what happens in this state is of no concern to those of us in the sunnier, if more *underdeveloped*, parts of the country.

Constructive dissent is the very essence of a meaningful editorial page. I don’t mean that a page has to be caustic—though that sometimes helps—or intemperate, that’s usually self-defeating, but I do mean that it should never relax in its questioning, probing, skeptical approach to public issues. Sometimes it will even end up praising a given action or individual—but the praise never should be automatic, perfunctory or obsequious.

It has been my experience that the more important the public official the less likely he is to appreciate these truths. It has always struck me as sardonically amusing that Presidents whom we have supported to the hilt have been particularly angered when we have criticized them from the standpoint of their own political principles or promises. I have found this to be especially true when we have criticized a Presidential action, or more likely a failure to act, on the basis of the expressed position of the President himself.

The Times warmly supported President Kennedy’s policy and program on Federal aid to education. When, however, the President began to compromise with Congress on this program on the theory that half a loaf would be better than none, we criticized the compromise and pressed as hard as we could for the President’s own original proposals. This kind of pressure from his own side of the fence could of course have been used by the President as a prop against his opponents, but he didn’t see it quite that way. The moral is that nobody likes to be criticized, even or especially by his friends; and Presidents like to be criticized least of all, the present President not excepted.

General Westmoreland, for whom I have great respect and regard and with whom I spent a remarkable day quite recently visiting American troops in combat in Vietnam, has suggested that there is something unpatriotic in ex-

pressing a dissenting opinion in this war because such expressions might encourage Hanoi. I would suggest that on the contrary it would be most unpatriotic for a newspaper—or for that matter an individual—to fail to express his dissent if he believes that such dissent represents the best interests of his country. To give up independence of judgment, to accept blindly the judgment of others, is truly a subversion of basic American principles. In fact, the real danger is not in too much independence, too much dissent, but rather too little—on the part of newspapers and their readers alike. The danger is too much timidity, not too little.

When the late Senator McCarthy burst upon the scene, the Times was one of the first American newspapers editorially to attack him. As we proceeded more and more deeply in our criticism of McCarthy—this at the height of the cold war—there were fears, or hopes (depending on who was talking)—that our position might anger so many readers that the newspaper could be seriously injured. I was astonished when one day at the height of our campaign I ran into the Circulation Manager in the hall and he said to me: “Those McCarthy editorials are making a lot of people awfully mad, but they’re having a marvelous effect on our circulation. Keep ‘em up.” Needless to say, that wasn’t *why* we kept them up; but the incident did give me an insight into the fact that a newspaper is not likely to lose by expressing its opinions, no matter how unpopular they are, if it expresses them with honesty and vigor.

Some years later, I remember the concern that surrounded our decision to alter precious policy and come out in favor of the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and recognition of that country by the United States. When in the fall of 1961, I proposed that we do this, I warned our then publisher that if we did so, we had to face the probability of a major storm and possibility of the loss of thousands of readers. We agreed, however, that to adopt this policy at that time was the right thing to do, and we did it. Instead of a myriad of cancellations and denunciations, we to our astonishment received a handful of protests and a multitude of praise—proving once again that the people of the country are often far ahead of Congress and the politicians, and also the newspapers.

On such other extremely touchy subjects as birth control long before it became a parlor game, or more humane abortion laws when the word was still hardly heard in polite society, or elimination of loyalty oaths in California

as well as in New York—on these and a hundred other emotion-packed issues, the editorial page must speak out, at the risk—in the certainty—of offending some readers.

While the total number of daily newspapers in the United States has remained astonishingly stationary for 20 years—in the neighborhood of 1750—the number of competitive newspapers still existing in the same city has drastically dropped. There are hardly a dozen communities in the entire country where there are two or more papers under different ownership. New York is still one such city, but only a few days ago we lost another of our major dailies before the insatiable demands of a voracious union.

This situation imposes a special obligation on the papers that survive to allow dissenting voices to be heard. While that does not mean ambiguous or two-sided editorials—on my own page I have even ruled out the phrase “on the other hand” as the symbol of everything that an editorial should not be—it does mean that a newspaper has the obligation to give the other side a chance.

The most important means of doing this is not through a proliferation of columnists, but rather through an amplitude of letters. I take the Letters column of our newspaper seriously and I consider the letters to the editor as a vital counterpoint—or perhaps antidote is the better word—to the editorials themselves. For it is through letters that the other side can be heard; and the other side *must* be heard. As our space permits publication of less than 10 per cent of the more than 25,000 letters received annually, we consider it a major responsibility to give space to representative letters, especially those taking a point of view in conflict with our own editorial position. The people whose letters we don’t print think we’re rankly discriminatory. We are—we discriminate in favor of good letters.

In this talk I have tried to outline to you some aspects of the editorial responsibility—the critical responsibility—of newspapers today. I think these responsibilities have in fact always been present; they are inherent in any free press at any time and any place. But they have a particular importance and immediacy today, when there is a discernible and disturbing tendency to drown out the voice of criticism with the strident trumpet of patriotism, and to muffle dissent beneath the drums of war.

The Russian poet Andrei Voznesensky said recently that the world of tomorrow belongs to the skeptical, sardonic, questioning youth of today. I think that’s obviously true, but I would add that if the America of tomorrow is going to be worth living in, a good share of the responsibility falls on a skeptical, sardonic, questioning press of today.

Four Bananas Aren't Thre Bananas And One Elongated Yellow Fruit

By James J. Kilpatrick

Mr. Kilpatrick, former editor of the editorial page of the Richmond (Virginia) News Leader, now devotes full time to his nationally-circulated editorial column, "The Conservative View," distributed by Washington Star Syndicate, Inc. He received the George Mason Award from the Richmond Professional chapter of Sigma Delta Chi in May for leadership in Virginia journalism.

HOLLINS COLLEGE, Va.—The student editors had come from a dozen Southeastern colleges to swap suggestions and receive awards; and now we were assembled on a white verandah, with a spring rain drenching the boxwoods, and the talk turned easily to shop talk.

All of the young writers had read E. B. White's "Elements of Style," and most of them had browsed in Fowler's "Modern English Usage." They had profited from Ernest Gowers and Ivor Brown and from courses redundantly styled "creative writing." They put the question to me, as a visiting newspaperman: Would I give them my own set of rules, with a few random examples thrown in, for writing newspaper copy? It was a temptation not to be resisted.

I pass these rules along here, for whatever value they may have to fellow workers in the carpentry of words. Every editor in the land could add some admonitions of his own.

1. Be clear. This is the first and greatest commandment. In a large sense, nothing else matters. For clarity em-

braceth all things; the clear thought to begin with; the right words for conveying that thought; the orderly arrangement of the words. It is a fine thing, now and then, to be colorful, to be vivid, to be bold. First be clear.

2. Love words, and treat them with respect. For words are the edged tools of your trade; you must keep them honed. Do not infer when you mean to imply; do not write fewer than, when you mean less than. Do not use among, when you mean between. Observe that continually and continuously have different meanings. Do not write alternately when you mean alternatively. Tints are light; shades are dark. The blob on the gallery wall is not an abstract. Beware the use of literally, virtually, fulsome, replica, many-faceted, and the lion's share. Pinch-hitters are something more than substitutes. Learn the rules of that and which. When you fall into the pit of "and which," climb out of your swampy sentence and begin anew.

3. As a general proposition, use familiar words. Be precise; but first be understood. Search for the solid nouns that bear the weight of thought. Use active verbs that hit an object and do not glance off. When you find an especially gaudy word, possessed of a gorgeous rhinestone glitter, lock it firmly away. Such words are costume jewels. They are sham.

4. Edit your copy; then edit it again; then edit it once more. This is the hand-rubbing process. No rough sandpapering can replace it.

5. Strike the redundant word. Emergencies are inherently acute; crises are grave; consideration is serious.

When you exhort your readers to get down to basic fundamentals, you are dog-paddling about in a pool of ideas and do not know where to touch bottom. Beware the little qualifying words: rather, somewhat, pretty, very. As White says, these are the leeches that suck the meaning out of language. Pluck them from your copy.

6. Have no fear of repetition. It is better to repeat a word than to send an orphaned antecedent in its place. Do not write horsehide, white pellet, or the old apple when you mean baseball. Members of City Council are not solons; they are members of City Council. If you must write banana four times, then write banana four times; nothing is gained by three bananas and one elongated yellow fruit.

7. If you cannot be obviously profound, try not to be profoundly obvious. Therefore, do not inform your reader that something remains to be seen. The thought will have occurred to him already.

8. Strive for a reasoned perspective. True crises come infrequently; few actions are outrageous; cities and economies are seldom paralyzed for long. A two-alarm fire is not a holocaust. Not much is imperative or urgent; still less is vital. To get at the size of a crowd, divide the cops' estimate by 3.1416.

9. Style depends in part upon the cadence of your prose. Therefore listen to your copy with a fine-tuned ear. In the prose that truly pleases you will find that every sentence has an unobtrusive rhythm that propels it on its way. With a little re-arranging you can keep the rhythm going. But do not do this always; you may sound like Hiawatha.

10. Beware of long sentences; they spread roots that tend to trip the reader up. The period key lies nicely on the bottom row of your machine, down toward the right-hand end. Use it. Use it often.

We Must Be Doing Something Right

By Roger Tatarian

Mr. Tatarian, Vice President and Editor of United Press International, delivered this address at the Boston Press Club's Annual Awards Dinner.

People get into journalism for a variety of reasons, but there is unquestionably one attraction common to us all—an opportunity to render a measure of service to our fellow citizens. No matter how sanctimonious it may sound, this feeling of vocation must be present in all of us. In a sense it is a pity that more isn't made of it in the promotional brochures we all send out to attract new talent—that here is a profession that enables a man to stand in for the public-at-large at the many events and occurrences which the public can never see but which still strongly affect it.

A great deal is made—I suppose it has to be made—of improved salaries, prolonged vacations, pensions and other tangible benefits. No matter how important these are, it is this rather intangible reward of journalism that provides the greatest satisfaction and which lures us into the fold in the first place.

One of the frustrating aspects of our profession is simply that it is taken for granted, so much so that too few people ever stop to ask how a society such as ours could function without it. However inspired were the men who drafted our Constitution, they did not provide in a positive way for all of the essentials of a viable democracy. They did something newspapermen are taught not to do—they proceeded on some basic assumptions.

One was that there would be an electorate with the desire and capacity to govern itself through the intricate machinery of government they set up. Another was that there would be an extra-legal medium such as the press to keep this electorate informed, to acquaint it with the issues of the day so that it could pass sensible judgment on elected officials—in short to equip it with the general awareness that must exist if a governmental system such as ours is to work.

Dozens of countries in the world have copied the U.S. Constitution and have found that there is no intrinsic magic in it. It has not worked for them as it has for us because these ingredients were missing in their countries.

The press, whatever its form, is the essential catalyst for the formation of public opinion, and public opinion is the basic fuel for the working of a democratic system. To the founding fathers the existence of a form of communication between government and public was as natural to assume as the presence of the air they breathed. So it is no great surprise that they did not feel it necessary to provide for it in a positive way. And yet, they did acknowledge its importance in a negative way with their first amendment admonition that Congress should make no law abridging its freedom.

No free institution gets that way without a fight and none can stay that way without a constant struggle. The fact that the press as an institution has always been the subject of controversy is, in a way, a compliment to its importance. But I think all of us may be forgiven if we

entertain a suspicion that the press today is being perhaps complimented far too often, and with a growing stridency.

Indeed your president revealed himself to be somewhat troubled by this barrage of criticism when he asked me to be with you tonight. He suggested that it might be nice to hear if the press was doing anything right. I think the purpose of this awards dinner answers that pretty eloquently. Since all of us here already have the faith, it might be useful if we examined the origins and sources of some of this criticism.

There are probably others, but three broad categories are showing particular zeal at the present time in their assaults on the press.

The first is the legal profession, which is currently brandishing the Sixth Amendment as its license to curtail the First, or is trying to use a Supreme Court ruling to do things the Court never intended.

The second is government—government at all levels—which works on the theory that if a mirror reflects something unpleasant, the solution is to attack the credibility of the mirror.

The third is what I would loosely lump together as The Dissenters, the pleaders for special causes, who are convinced that they are the only vessels of truth, and who are unable to distinguish between the world as they would like it and the world as it really is.

I suspect we are all a bit weary of the debate about free trial and free press, but I suggest we should not allow boredom to prevent us from battling on. If the bar associations have done anything here, they have proved that if you shout a fantasy long enough, people will believe it. Even we in the press have begun to believe it. We have resigned ourselves here and there to joint committees and joint codes on the theory that it is better to accept a restraint voluntarily than to have someone impose it on you.

There isn't anything wrong with that approach provided the need for a restraint has been proved beyond question. I have an uncomfortable feeling that the press has sometimes yielded to less than overwhelming evidence. If the prisons of this country were bulging with persons wrongly convicted because of newspaper coverage, then surely something would be indicated.

But what should impress us most is the lack of any such evidence. There isn't much point in my saying that, because I am certainly a partisan pleader in this case. But listen for a moment to a statement by Claude R. Sowle, who is a very distinguished lawyer. He is in fact dean of law at the University of Cincinnati, and he said in a speech last year:

"Who can come forth with any satisfactory proof of harm to defendants resulting from pretrial publicity? Frankly, I have yet to see such proof provided by the proponents of restrictions on the press in this area. In fact,

to the extent that proof may be available, it seems, if anything, to go against the press restrictionists."

Dean Sowle did not always feel this way about it. At one point in his career he would have followed the ABA's party line.

"I have," he said, "abandoned my original view that pretrial publicity has reached the point where it is generally harmful to our system of criminal justice. Moreover, during this same period of careful observation, my basic confidence in the wisdom, effectiveness and good taste of a free press has grown considerably."

No Supreme Court decision in recent years has been misinterpreted or misapplied as widely as the court's ruling in the famous case of Dr. Sam Sheppard. Lower court judges, police chiefs, prosecutors and sheriffs have taken it to mean that it is now open season on the press and line up here for your shooting license.

Certainly the Sheppard decision did cite some excesses of press coverage. But the cause of all this is laid squarely at the doorstep of a failure of the judicial process. In writing his prescription, Justice Tom Clark did not address it to the press but to judges, prosecutors, defense counsel, enforcement officers and others coming under a court's jurisdiction.

Among other things, the court's ruling was mistakenly taken as an invitation to impose contempt penalties on the press, and the ABA's Reardon Committee accepted the invitation, to no one's great surprise. I am delighted the press reacted as it did to the Reardon report, and I was not surprised that Judge Reardon mourned the press reaction. And yet it has paid off. The Reardon Committee, as you know, has modified its original report and backed away from the most dangerous of its contempt provisions. I am not saying that the press should now subscribe to the modified Reardon report. Far from it, I am still waiting for evidence that the ills it seeks to cure are worse than those it will cause.

As the saying goes, some of my best friends are lawyers, but I doubt a surrender here would get them off our backs. Their ranks, too, are filled with other kinds of reformers. A few days ago a gentleman named Mordecai Merker wrote a letter to the Washington Post. Mr. Merker is general counsel to the Office of Emergency Planning, and his letterhead is emblazoned "Executive Office of the President." His thesis was beautifully simple: If newspapers stopped printing so much crime news, the crime rate would decrease.

I give you his own words in one regard: "It might never occur to an individual to commit a crime if the idea were not suggested to him. But most people who read the newspapers, or listen to news reports on television and radio, are no longer shocked by the terrible crimes that are committed each day to persons unknown to them.

They have been taught to accept crime as a thing that happens."

One could be forgiven, I think, for wondering aloud which newspaper Cain had been reading when he got the idea of killing Abel. The Good Book does not tell us, but Mr. Merker would seem to have other sources of information.

Mr. Merker's naiveté becomes alarming, however, when the lawyer in him takes over. He thinks the press should voluntarily shape its reporting so as to emphasize only the capture and punishment of a criminal. If the press fails to do it voluntarily, he says, the states then "can exercise their police power and can impose reasonable legislative restraints upon the press without violating the right of freedom of speech and press."

The moral here, if any, is that the assaults on the First Amendment are going to continue, and we might as well be set for a continuing battle.

The battle between press and government is an older one, and there is nothing unnatural about it. The time to worry would be when press and government began speaking with one voice. We have, fortunately, never had such harmony, and the present time is no exception. I do not say that the present national administration is better or worse than any of its predecessors. All I can say is that it is a political administration like its predecessors. It is therefore anxious to put only its best foot forward, and likely to get annoyed when the press does anything but commend it.

Since the present administration is the one we have to live with, it is just as well to know the current practitioners.

President Johnson's sensitivity about the press is well known and there is little I can add to your store of knowledge. Vice-President Humphrey is generally an affable man but he was, as you know, not too happy with press treatment of his recent trip to Europe, and he did not hesitate to give us some critical advice when he got back. Secretary McNamara's Defense Department has a reputation for putting the greatest strains on credibility, and this reputation is by no means unearned. But an outsider is coming up strong in this arena and I command him to your attention.

This is Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. Secretary Wirtz is a man of high intellect and his arguments are surrounded with such logic, learning and sweet reason that, like the legal fraternity, he leaves you feeling as though you must have some jam smeared on your face even though you don't remember eating any.

The secretary has made two speeches on the subject in the past five months and they were pretty high-class perorations. Of course, he tipped his hat to the press, mentioned its importance in a democratic society, paraphrased and

subscribed to the well-known sentiment of Thomas Jefferson and so on.

But he also suggested that if there was a credibility gap, the press might be contributing to it. He did not put that in the form of a charge. Rather, he invoked the rhetorical question which, we know as well as he, amounts to the same thing. One of his statements went thus:

"It is worth asking what standard of 'credibility' it is that inspires or permits an editor to persist in protesting the alleged inflationary effects of the paper imbalance of the government's 'administrative budget' when he knows (and he knows most of his readers don't know) that only the much more nearly balanced 'national incomes account budget' bears any relationship to national economic stability."

What the secretary did here was to identify himself as a believer in the new economics which reverse the old idea that debts are to be avoided if possible and paid off if inevitable.

I do not profess to understand all the intricacies of the administrative budget, the national incomes account budget or the cash budget. But I do know that presidents themselves, for reasons of tradition and politics, have always emphasized the administrative budget since it first came into use in 1921. One reason may be that this budget almost invariably shows a smaller spending figure than the national accounts income budget, and men in public office prefer to choose the lowest available figure when talking about spending of public funds. On the other hand, the national incomes account budget generally shows smaller deficits or larger surpluses, and perhaps this is why Secretary Wirtz would have us look at this rosier column of figures when we talk about the debt. If he had commended the same budget to us for both spending and debt figures, I think all of us might have been more receptive.

Secretary Wirtz's second speech on the subject was a tour de force, and I cannot even begin to summarize it. I was left open-mouthed, however, by two observations in an area that I did know something about.

One was with reference to how newspapers generally have reacted to television.

"It has the effect," he said, "a new tabloid coming to town used to have. Instead of looking for what the newspaper can do better—the tendency is try to be more spectacular—to beat the newcomer at its own game; to get to press faster, regardless of what this may mean in terms of less complete coverage. . . ."

The fact of the matter, of course, is that newspapers have become far less spectacular since the advent of television. They put out fewer editions, not more, as he suggests, and consequently there is less of a rush to go to press. They explain, interpret and background far more than they

used to. This is precisely because they know they cannot beat radio and TV in terms of speed but that they can do these other things better.

At another point he suggested that newspapers front page occasional news about racial extremists, black or white, simply to "sell papers." The secretary obviously is living back in the era when street sales were everything. He simply does not know that most by far of the 61,000,000 newspapers sold daily in this country are sold by continuing subscription and not à la carte, on the basis of the scariest headline.

Defense Secretary McNamara put out an order the other day calling for a free flow of news to the public except, he said, for that which would be of material assistance to potential enemies. I hope that this will represent a major change.

If I sound skeptical it is because the UPI has had a recent experience in which Mr. McNamara was very much involved.

Late in January our Saigon staff filed a story quoting informed U.S. sources as saying that barring some dramatic change in the direction of the war, the U.S. would in a few weeks begin bombing MIG bases in North Vietnam.

On the very next day Mr. McNamara was testifying before a Senate committee and was asked how he evaluated press coverage. He referred specifically to the UPI story of the day before as an example of incorrect and irresponsible reporting. He said he doubted whether such statements had been made and that even if they had been, they were completely wrong.

It is not incumbent on the secretary to tell North Vietnam what we are going to do next. But neither is it incumbent upon him to assault the credibility of a major news medium with a wholly unjustified statement suggesting that he knew everything that every officer in Vietnam had said to reporters the day before. Quite obviously he did not, because the statements we reported were in fact made. And, as a matter of fact, the bombing of MIG bases forecast in our dispatch began a month ago.

With things like this happening, it should not be all that hard for men in official position to understand why there is a credibility gap, and we should not, like polite gentlemen, allow them to brush it off on us. I cannot begin to explain why the undeniable is so frequently denied, or why the obvious is too often reluctantly conceded. But I do know that it happens with distressing frequency.

We come now to the very broad category of critics who are simply dissenters of one kind or another. There are

too many to enumerate, so let us refer solely to those who mutter or shout knowingly that the press "isn't giving us the full story" of the Vietnam war. What story is it that they want? They seem to feel that every peasant in South Vietnam is running around with a "welcome Ho Chi Minh" or "American go home" sign in his hands, or that American planes are concentrating on dropping napalm on defenseless women and children in the north. Well, neither proposition is true. Anytime anyone tells you the press isn't giving the full story from Vietnam, you can be sure that you are talking to a critic of the war. They simply conclude the absence of what they want to hear is a failure by someone else to report it.

The fact is that this is the best covered war there has been, and I refer not only to the military war. Everybody knows of inefficiency and corruption in South Vietnam, of the widespread war weariness and confusion that infects the average peasant, and the reason they know it is that the press has reported and continues to report it.

Well, none of us has any desire to silence the critics, no matter which particular club they belong to. Life would be duller without them and they can, in fact, render a service to the press and everyone else. All we can ask is that they do less violence to truth or reality in their criticism.

The day simply isn't going to come, nor should it, when the press is the object of unanimous adulation. But I do believe the press as a whole has been too passive in the face of some of this criticism.

I often ask myself why the press, which is so generous in reporting the awards of Oscars and Emmies, gets shy when Pulitzer and other major journalism awards are made and so often buries them under awards for drama or literature. If the image of the press as an unofficial ombudsman of the public interest is to remain bright, we at least should not hesitate to give it a brisk polishing from time to time.

Publishing critical letters to the editor, or reporting critical speeches made by men in high office is simply a part of our job. But the failure to challenge and reply too often is taken to mean there is no reply.

If the critics do nothing else, they keep us stimulated and that alone is important. So all things considered, I hope the complaints keep coming in—so long as they come uniformly from left, right and center. That will only show, in the words of the popular commercial, that we must be doing something right.

Miracles of Research

(Continued from page 2)

swiftly spread through many newspaper plants—the Dow rapid etch process and the “no pack” mat.

Periodically someone paraphrases the famous question which a constituent directed to Kentucky’s Alben Barkley after his recital of the benefits which had flowed from his legislative activity—“What has the laboratory done for us *lately?*” Perhaps the results have been less spectacular than in earlier years, but I’m not sure that the usefulness of the Laboratory hasn’t actually greatly increased—that is as an energizer for newspapers and other organizations to initiate developments on their own. In the first place, if you were to examine the “guest book” at Easton, you would discover visitations from many of the leading names in the electronic and graphic arts world. The Laboratory and its operations have provided a definite spur to manufacturers in our business to make them move out, to make them reach. The developments in photocomposition and in offset for newspapers have definitely been pushed along by the Institute and the Laboratory. The improvement in newsprint and inks has also been stimulated by the staff at Easton. The very presence of the Laboratory is a symbol of newspaper production progress over the past 20 years.

As a symbol of the contributions of the production department of ANPA-RI, in addition to this conference, we can point to the Technical Advisory Service which operates out of the New York Research Institute headquarters. Since the Production Conference last year more than 30 TAS visits have been made to ANPA member newspapers throughout the United States, thus bringing expert advisory service directly to the user in the form of layout for new plants, consultation on configuration of equipment and problem-solving.

I especially want to pay tribute today to the ANPA Scientific Advisory Committee which has made a major contribution to the forward thrust of Research Institute activities. It has been five years since three outstanding scientists first agreed to serve the newspaper business. The chairman through the years has been Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, professor of geophysics at the University of Minnesota, and certainly one of the most creative scientists in the world today. Dr. Spilhaus was appointed by President Johnson as a member of the National Science Board, and not so incidentally, he is the creator and author of a newspaper comic strip panel called, “Our New Age.”

The other original member of the committee is Dr. John F. Pierce, executive director of communications research,

Bell Telephone Laboratories—the scientist who has devoted himself to communications principles, who carried a good deal of the burden of the Telstar program, and who, incidentally, is a writer of note himself.

The original third member of the committee was Trevor Gardner, former assistant secretary of the Air Force for research and development. His untimely death late in 1963 posed a great problem in seeking a replacement for this unusual man whose counsel was uniquely valuable in the full sense of the word.

The newest member of the committee is Dr. Carl F. J. Overhage and I want to describe his work at Massachusetts Institute of Technology because I think it will serve to illustrate how important it is that we have these three men on our team and also so that you will better understand the significance of the new program which the ANPA Research Institute has launched this year at MIT.

Dr. Overhage is in charge of a program at MIT called INTREX. This stands for INformation TRansfer EXperiments. By tomorrow you will remember only relatively few things that are said on this platform today, but this is one thought I hope you will carry away with you. Our scientific advisors have been telling us now for five years that all of us are in the information transfer business, not just the newspaper business. They caution us constantly not to make the mistake which railroads made earlier in this century when they did not recognize that they were in the Transportation business and not just the railroad business.

Let me underline one anticipated educational result of great future importance: Dr. Overhage and MIT expect to produce an entirely new breed of scientists—information transfer engineers. And I hope that three or four years from now these engineering graduates of MIT will be carrying information transfer technology to other educational institutions and directly to newspapers.

I’m not going to report in any greater detail on our ANPA program at MIT because there are two speakers who are here from the campus to describe it for you. One is Professor William Kehl, whose work is partially supported by the ANPA-RI grant to MIT. Dr. Frank Reintjes, director of all engineering laboratories at MIT, will also be speaking to you tomorrow.

I only want to make two other points about the program at MIT: 1. It is the intention of the ANPA Research Institute to establish an office and small laboratory in Tech Square in a building located right on the MIT campus. 2. We will soon be announcing the appointment of a man who will operate in this office and serve as the direct liaison with MIT, Professor Kehl, Dr. Reintjes and with the Easton Laboratory and the production department of the Research Institute. This will coordinate the full spectrum of our research activity from the search for advanced

technology in the vast complex at MIT to the inplant technical advisory service operating out of New York.

Let me emphasize once again that the new program at MIT encompasses the whole range of applications of computer and other new technology to the newspaper process from the reporter to the reader. We will be investing a total of about \$100,000 per year in this advanced research program in the relatively new world of information transfer.

Because we are talking about advanced research, it may be appropriate to say a few words about the "electronic newspaper," a phrase which seems to stir psychedelic reactions in many quarters. A month or so ago several of us gathered at MIT to provide the scientists there an opportunity to ask some questions about our business. Many of the questions probed toward an estimate of when newspapers might be ready to "make the jump" toward "the little black box in the family room." For whatever they are worth, I will give you my thoughts on this subject.

I think it is reasonable to assume that in 1980 there will still be a significant demand for the printed, packaged newspaper as we now know it. It may look quite different from what we know it to be today, and it may be delivered in a different manner, but the desire for the printed newspaper in its organized, folded, packaged form will still be very strong.

There is no question that technologically, the electronic newspaper is here. It is well to recall that the Knight newspapers ventured into facsimile operations in the late 1940's. In the period from 1946 to 1948 the Miami Herald placed facsimile machines in hotel lobbies and received monthly rental fees from the hotels for the transmittal of news reports to the machines.

Jim Knight has told me that the FM receivers of that day lacked stability and that the only way to correct the problems of "drift" was to go into manufacturing themselves. This they decided not to do and the whole facsimile operation was given to the University of Miami.

Four years ago one of the Tokyo newspapers was transmitting full newspaper pages into a department store. And they may still be doing so.

The Wall Street Journal, of course, transmits production negatives of its pages from San Francisco to Riverside, California.

When I visited Stockholm two years ago I watched Dagens-Nyheter transmit full pages by telephone line to Jonkoping 200 miles away.

So it is very clear that the technology is with us. It has been for some time. Why, then, have we not seen any swift development of this capability?

The answer is two-fold: 1. Expense to the originator, to the entrepreneur. 2. Desire on the part of the customer.

Although the parallel is not exact, it is interesting to

note the development of color television. You may remember that General David Sarnoff of RCA began working on this, almost as a personal crusade, in the early 1950's. Over the years, General Sarnoff committed perhaps as much as a half billion dollars in research and development funds as a manufacturer and through NBC in programming expense when there was no chance of recovery through the sale of color advertising commercials.

Despite this mammoth commitment of research and development, it is estimated that by the end of this year, approximately 20 per cent of American television homes will have color sets. The current penetration figure is only about 17 per cent. This, you must remember, is after 15 years of availability of a highly desirable entertainment commodity.

The expense to the customer, of course, is also a factor. If you want "instant news" in your home or office today, you can have a Dow-Jones news ticker installed. But the cost is substantial and the product is not in the most convenient form for your subsequent use.

I think it is important, however, to recognize that the American public *will* pay for what they consider an improvement in the reception of entertainment and information into the home. There are now approximately 1,750 CATV systems and about 2¼ million home subscribers to these community antenna television systems. These include some areas where CATV provides the only means for TV reception. On the average this means in each case an installment fee of about \$20 and a \$5 per-month on-going charge for improved television reception—more channels and clearer pictures, better color and in some cases a so-called news channel which repeats news and weather information, primarily off an AP wire report.

So as we look to the future, as we seek to direct and encourage the advanced research program at MIT, we must keep in mind the technological capability for some sort of print-out of news information in the home. This will exist in the future as a competitive possibility for the printed newspaper as we now know it.

But there will be many more elements of competition, and perhaps a so-called "electronic newspaper" will not be as formidable a competitor as some of the others.

Please remember the audience we're dealing with. It's changing! It is much better educated and it is becoming much younger. Here is another fact I would like to engrave on your mind—the *average age of Americans dropped a full eight years in the last decade and we are now at the point where every other American is age 25 or under*. This is a vitally important fact which we must keep in mind as we look at the present and future elements of competition for newspaper buying and reading.

Let's look at the competitors.

We've already talked about the growth and development

of color television. Lower set prices and the extension of color sets will continue, although the pace is slowing this year.

The use of television as an educational device continues to rise. The national proposals for educational TV systems are extremely significant. The Ford Foundation proposal for a satellite system financed by the networks continues to receive attention. The Carnegie Commission report proposing a tax on television sets to develop improved educational TV programming brought forth an offer from CBS of a contribution of \$1 million.

State organizations and educational institutions are focusing on the educational TV setup with a view toward increasing the capability and improving the programming for transmission into both schools and homes. Developments in this whole educational TV area may offset one of the increasing problems of TV as a whole—the failure to maintain viewing interest of the better educated and affluent families.

I would like to direct your attention, however, to the broadcast field of competition for attention and interest. The increase in intensity of appeals by the audio-visual arts all around us must be put in perspective with the previous statement I made about the dominating impact of young people in our society. Let me just mention a few of these growing “interest magnets” with which the printed newspaper must compete:

—The home video recorder is still a very expensive item, but as the price drops, its use and utility could become much more widespread with capability for producing “real time” home movies and intermixing them with videotaping directly off the television set.

—Today the arts are in a greater state of ferment than ever before and the traditional distinctions between media seem to be breaking down. Recently we had an exhibition in Minneapolis devoted entirely to “light sculpture.” Electronic music in experiments with the projection of three-dimensional images are expanding the artists’ communication and indeed expanding the public’s horizons for audio-visual stimulation. They are already seeing intermedia experiments which combine elements of painting, sculpture, dance, film and theatre.

—Printed color reproduction in books and magazines seems to be improving dramatically. The increase in sale of books, from paperbacks to the expensive art and science “heavyweights,” has set up a whole new area of competition for the dollars and the reading time of the newspaper family.

—In the future we will probably be competing with audio tapes, TV tapes and cartridges, computerized

information systems—a whole catalog of new channels of information.

Looking to the future, what can we do about all of this? There is no question in my mind that as publishers of printed newspapers there are many things we can do in the face of escalating competition.

In the first place, I think we must look toward a dramatic improvement in the appearance of newspapers. It is still amazing to me that few, if any, major newspapers have a full-time art director whose principal job is to help design and execute the appearance of the paper in a way that it will be most attractive to the reader.

The Research Institute is charged with the responsibility for improving the result when ink meets paper. I’m sure there is great room for improvement both in offset and letterpress reproduction and we must pursue this vigorously.

But publishers must begin to insist on better quality reproduction from the equipment we now have. I was struck when I visited the PATRA laboratories at Leatherhead in England a year or so ago that one of the scientists there said he was convinced that we are all much too casual about our quality control. We allow much too wide tolerances in all of our operations, equipment and supplies, probably starting with our newsprint.

There is one thing we can do, however, and that is to ask our production people for their utmost performance to achieve quality. I think the emphasis alone would produce many positive results.

The whole area of packaging has great potential. I think that all of us could probably be doing a better job on food and homemaker sections, for example. When we see what Family Circle and Women’s Day are able to sell at point of purchase, there is no reason why we should not develop our own capability in this field.

The flexibility of spectacolor printing and the insertion of simultaneously-printed offset sections have great potential for the future.

I’m not sure we are yet making optimum use of classified advertising sections. The utility value of being able to find advertising news about specific items may be much greater.

By extending the packaging concept, we can take advantage of our distribution capability and make it possible for our customers to order material in “paperback book” form if that form is desired. Some of these books might be reprints of material from our pages; others might be correlative or supplementary material.

We should take advantage of new packaging concepts to develop the newspaper as an instrument for continuing education. Again, when we recognize that more than one-

fourth of the United States population is now in school, it becomes apparent that the desire for continuing education and for educational materials is a strong one. Newspapers must place themselves in a position to serve more directly in this field.

In his address to the ANPA annual convention in New York this past April, ANPA president J. Howard Wood pointed to "1966 as a year of splendid accomplishments" for ANPA member newspapers. One tangible evidence of those accomplishments was the fact that 747 U.S. and Canadian newspapers spent more than \$148 million in 1966 for plant expansion and modernization, and the anticipated expenditure for 1967 is about \$150 million. This is one measure of the forward thrust of the business.

President Wood, in his recent annual speech, also said, "but before we become too content and too self-satisfied, I would like to point out that we face serious problems and challenges. . . ."

I have tried this morning to look ahead to some of those challenges involving technology.

In closing, I would like to describe for you a project in which I became involved three or four years ago and which now is on the launching pad. In my opinion it has wide implications for the world of information transfer and for the newspaper business. Athel Spilhaus and I are co-chairmen of a national steering committee for the research and development of an Experimental City.

This project takes a different course from the Model City and New City programs which you have heard about. The mission here is to research, design and construct a city for perhaps a quarter of a million people located 50 to 100 miles from a major metropolitan area and thus to bring into actual use all of the new technology and all of the new information we have in the social sciences that might produce not a "utopia" but a city that would come closer to what our society deserves if it were able to harness its vast brain power, technology and resources together with a human plan for a city starting fresh. We feel that this project, at every stage along the way, will

have tremendously important ideas that can immediately be put into use in the troublesome, almost disastrous, problems which are strangling our urban centers today.

First phase research on the Experimental City is beginning this very week at the University of Minnesota. Our steering committee met in Minneapolis last Thursday and we had with us Buckminster Fuller and Walter Heller, General Bernard Schriever, Walter Beattie, the sociologist and Dr. James Cain of the Mayo Clinic. The Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Health, Education and Welfare and the Economic Development Agency of the Department of Commerce have each granted \$80,000 to the University of Minnesota for this first phase of research. Private industry has contributed an equal amount for this research. About a year from now we would expect to go into Phase II which includes the preliminary design work and model construction for the city.

Let me just say that the communications and information transfer aspects of this project have immense implications for the future of newspapers. The Minneapolis Star and Tribune is one of the sponsoring companies for the first phase of research.

The very preliminary thoughts hold exciting possibilities for the future. The obvious opportunity to "start fresh" makes it possible to think in terms of a pneumatic delivery system for mail and newspapers built underground into every home and building. Broad band communications facilities would be built into every home; Laser technology will be under intense study.

Let me just conclude by saying that the preliminary scheduled date for occupation of the city is in the year 1977. I am confident that if the people in this room perform up to their capabilities that the printed newspaper will be a growing, dynamic information transfer commodity in the Experimental City. It will have strong competition as it has had throughout the last three decades, but in my opinion it can emerge from this exciting period of rapid change in a stronger position than ever.

Nieman Notes

1951

Hoke Norris, literary editor of the Chicago Sun-Times, has been named editor of Book Week. The Sun-Times is resuming publication of the Sunday book section that was once published by the New York Herald Tribune.

Dana Adams Schmidt, correspondent for the New York Times, was among several journalists arrested during the Middle East crisis last June. His arrest occurred in Amman.

1956

Harry Press, former city editor of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, is editor of The Stanford Observer at Stanford University in Palo Alto, California. The monthly newspaper is distributed among alumni, parents, students and faculty.

Donald J. Sterling, Jr., associate editor of the Oregon Journal's (Portland) editorial page for the past 5½ years, has been appointed editor of the editorial page. He succeeds Roy J. Beadle who was editor of the page for the past 12 years.

1959

Howard Simons, an assistant managing editor of The Washington Post, won the

Raymond Clapper Award for 1966. Simons, a science writer, won the \$1,000 award for a series on the hydrogen bomb which was lost near Palomares, Spain, on January 17, 1966.

1960

Jack Burby, press secretary to former Governor Edmund G. Brown of California, is doing public relations for the U.S. Transportation Agency.

1965

Arthur Geiselman, a reporter for the Baltimore Sun, won the Washington-Baltimore Newspaper Guild's front page award for public service reporting in 1966 on injustices in Baltimore.

1966

Charles A. Ferguson, a reporter for the New Orleans States-Item, has been made associate editor of the States-Item.

1967

Alvin Shuster, assistant news editor of the New York Times Washington Bureau, has been assigned to the Times' London Bureau. He replaces William Blair who will return to New York for reassignment.